

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                      | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/742,657   | 12/21/2000  | Hidenori Nishikawa   | JP9 1999 0204 US1       | 6991             |
| 7590 11/03/2003  Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC |             |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
|  |             |                      | MAHMOUDI, HASSAN        |                  |
| Three E-Comm Square Albany, NY 12207                 |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| •  |             |                      | 2175                    | n                |
|  |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003 | 1/               |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |
|--|---|---|
|  | 09/742,657  | NISHIKAWA, HIDENORI   |
| Advisory Action  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |
|  | Tony Mahmoudi   | 2175  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication   |   |   |
| THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2003 FAILS TO P<br>Therefore, further action by the applicant is require<br>inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eitle<br>condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of<br>Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1   | d to avoid abandonment of tl<br>her: (1) a timely filed amendr<br>Appeal (with appeal fee); or  | his application. A proper reply to a ment which places the application in   |
| PERIOD FC  | OR REPLY [check either a) or  | r b)]   |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the n   | •   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of t event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the ship above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the transport of the period of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | later than SIX MONTHS from the many WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT.  The date on which the petition under of extension and the corresponding an ortened statutory period for reply original. | illing date of the final rejection.  HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe<br>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3  |   |   |
| 2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be ente   | ered because:   |   |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require   | further consideration and/or  | search (see NOTE below);  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see I  | Note below);  |   |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the applications issues for appeal; and/or  | ation in better form for appea  | al by materially reducing or simplifying the  |
| (d) they present additional claims without of  | anceling a corresponding nu   | mber of finally rejected claims.  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |   |   |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following  | rejection(s):   | ·   |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) realized claim(s).</li> </ol>  | would be allowable if submitt   | ted in a separate, timely filed amendment   |
| 5. ☐ The a ☐ affidavit, b ☐ exhibit, or c ☐ requapplication in condition for allowance because   |   | een considered but does NOT place the   |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |   | SOLELY to issues which were newly   |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clai   | dment(s) a)⊠ will not be ento<br>ims would be rejected is prov  | ered or b) will be entered and an vided below or appended.  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as fo   | llows:  |   |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .   |   |   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   | ·   |   |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on  |   | disapproved by the Examiner.  |
| 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Sta   |   | •   |
| 0. Other:  | .,,   | 6) Ph   |
|  |   | DOV POPOVICIÓ<br>SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE<br>TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100   |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/742,657





Application No.

## Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The newly added claim limitation of the node data for "use when" the first application program "is run, wherein the first hierarchical link table includes an identifier that identifies the first application program", and the limitation of the node data for "use when" the second application program "is run, wherein the second hierarchical link table includes an identifier that identifies the second application program", found in claim 6, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

The newly added claim limitation of "and wherein the node attributes comprise non-relational data", found in claim 7, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant's arguments presented in the After Final amendment, filed on 14-October-2003 have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, and/or have already been addressed by the examiner in the Final Rejection office action mailed on 13-August-2003 (paper Number 11.)

The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because the newly added claim limitations found in claims 6 and 7 raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and the claim limitations of the "finally rejected" claims are still met by the Mital et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,012), Fehskens et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,591), Suver (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,497), and Lynch-Aird (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,402) references.